REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thoughtful review of the application and for his helpful discussion of current USPTO policies regarding statutory subject matter in connection with method claims in light of recent Federal Circuit decisions.

Claims 21-23 and 25-31 remain in the application. In the current action, the prior rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were withdrawn. All claims were rejected on subject matter grounds under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for lacking wording tying the method steps to statutory elements. The claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for omitting structural elements associated with the recited method steps. However, the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter, stating that all of the rejected claims would be allowable if amended or rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, second paragraph.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's discussion of patentable subject matter, and amended the claims in light of the principles stated therein. Applicant believes that the amendments set out above are responsive and should meet both grounds of rejection.

The claims were amended to add language tying the method steps recited to the computer hardware elements on which the steps are carried out.

As amended, the claims recite a method for processing financial instruments "on a system of digital computers and related storage devices, networks and peripherals". Support for this specific language exists in paragraph 32 of the published specification. In addition, the claims refer to various software "objects" being "recorded in at least one storage device readable by at least one said computer". This is also supported by the disclosure of "storage devices" in paragraph 32 of the published specification, and is additionally supported by paragraphs 72, 76-78 and 209-216 of the published specification (see in particular, paragraph 214), which discuss how relational and object databases may be alternatively used to provide such storage, and in Figure 6, illustrating an example of embodiment providing for either type of storage to be used in the alternative. Paragraph 214 of the Specification indicates that the event representation of the in-

5

strument can be stored in non-persistent storage as well (e.g., random access memory).

In accordance with Applicant's approach, the claimed method steps involving "providing" a software object now recite where and how the object is stored and made available (readable) on a statutory device (computer-readable storage device). The steps reciting "processing" recite that the processing is performed on at least one of the computers identified in the claim preamble. In this manner, all method steps have been explicitly tied to statutory hardware elements in the body of the claim.

CONCLUSION

All matters set forth in the Office Action have been addressed. Applicant requests favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments, and earnestly solicits allowance.

Dated: May 22, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald Abramson #34,762/
Ronald Abramson
Registration No. 34,762
Attorney for Applicant

HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1482
(212) 837-6404